

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/26/100876

Site Address: 5 FRYERN CLOSE, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 2LF

Case Officer: Gregg Chapman

Description: Erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Within Urban Edge • Within Established Residential Area		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
F/25/99379 - Erection of 1.no 2-bedroom dwelling and sever land from 5 Fryern Close – Refused, June 2025 for the reasons; 1. The proposed development, by virtue of the introduction of an additional attached dwelling to form a terrace of three, would be out of keeping with the established character of Fryern Close, which is defined by two-storey semi-detached pairs of dwellings. The proposed dwelling would disrupt the consistent and coherent pattern of development in the area and, due to its greater width, would appear visually dominant and incongruous within the street scene. The proposal would fail to respect the prevailing character and appearance of the surrounding built environment and does not take full and proper account of the site context. As such, the development is contrary to Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016–2036). 2. The proposed development, by reason of its siting and the positioning of upper floor windows facing towards the rear elevation and garden of 4 Fryern Close, would result in a greater degree of overlooking and a harmful loss of privacy. The increased views into the private outdoor space would diminish the amenity and enjoyment of that space for existing occupants. As such, the development would have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers, contrary to Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016–2036). 3. The application fails to provide for the required mitigation to offset the impacts of the development on the European protected Solent Complex (SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites) and New Forest SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites, from additional recreational pressure and nutrient loading generated by the population increase and additional sewage resulting from the development. The application is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), Paragraphs 180 and 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and the provisions of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. 4. The application fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would adequately protect or conserve existing biodiversity interests on the site. In the absence of sufficient ecological information and mitigation measures, the proposal fails to comply with Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016–2036), which seeks to protect, conserve and enhance biodiversity and ensure no net loss of ecological value. 5. The application fails to demonstrate compliance with the statutory requirement as set out in the Environment Act 2021 and associated regulations, to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The submitted information is incomplete and does not meet national validation standards. Key details necessary to assess the baseline habitat value, proposed habitat enhancements, and overall biodiversity outcomes are		

either missing or insufficient. As a result, the application does not provide adequate evidence that the intended purchase of off-site credits will achieve the necessary measurable net gain in biodiversity, contrary to policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016–2036 or the requirements of the Environment Act 2021.

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	1 letter – Objection • The extension will encroach on by boundary • The side extension will affect the light to my garden and property • Not in keeping with the road and may well cause extra cars		
Ecology	No objection		
Parish Council:	No response received		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 9 th April 2026		

Policy: National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance Development Plan: The <u>Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036</u> • S1 (Delivering sustainable development); • DM1 (General criteria for new development); • DM11 (Nature conservation); • DM13 (Transport); • DM14 (Parking); Supplementary Planning Documents: • Quality Places; • Residential Parking Standards; • Biodiversity; • Character Area Appraisals.

Assessment: <u>Principle of Development</u> The site lies within the urban edge and, as such, the principle of extending the existing dwelling is acceptable, subject to compliance with the relevant development plan policies and supplementary guidance. <u>Character and Appearance</u> Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016 – 2036 requires development to take full and proper account of the context of the site and to be well integrated in terms of mass, scale, design, layout and siting. The supporting text to the Local Plan makes clear that the Council is strongly committed to promoting good design and that the Quality Places SPD provides more detailed guidance on design principles and layout. This also reflects the NPPF expectations for high standards of design.
--

The earlier refusal under F/25/99379 is a significant material consideration in respect of design. In refusing that scheme, it was found that Fryern Close is characterised by “two-storey semi-detached pairs of dwellings” and that the previous proposal would appear “visually dominant and incongruous within the street scene”. Although the current application no longer proposes a separate additional dwelling, the underlying design issue identified in that decision remains relevant because it concerned the way built form would read in the street scene, not simply the creation of a new planning unit.

The Quality Places SPD is directly relevant to the assessment of the current proposal. It advises that single or two storey side or rear extensions should be in scale and balance with the whole house; that setting an extension back from the front wall will often help the original building retain its dominance; and that semi-detached houses are normally designed as a “matching pair”. The SPD also states that for semi-detached properties or streets with a uniform roof design, “significant alterations to the roof are generally unacceptable”, that “Long monotonous rooflines should be avoided”, and illustrates that keeping the ridge and eaves of an extension lower than the main building helps the original house maintain its dominance.

In this case, while the proposal has been amended from a separate dwelling to a side extension, the two-storey addition would still carry the roof form across in a manner that is not sufficiently subservient to the host dwelling. The scheme does not step the ridge or eaves down and instead produces an elongated roof form. As a result, the building would no longer read satisfactorily as one of a semi-detached pair, and the extension would appear as an over-dominant addition rather than a subordinate enlargement.

This harm is further compounded by the proposed lone side-facing dormer. That feature is not found elsewhere on side elevations within Fryern Close and does not reflect the simple roof forms that characterise the existing dwellings within the cul-de-sac. It would therefore appear as an incongruous addition to the roofscape and to the side elevation, which would otherwise present as a simple flank wall, and by reason of its prominent position would be readily visible in the street scene. In addition, when viewed from the side, the resulting roof form would appear awkwardly asymmetrical, giving the extension an odd and poorly resolved appearance. Rather than reading as a coherent and sympathetic enlargement, the proposal would appear visually unbalanced and contrived in its roof design.

Taken together, the elongated roof, the lack of a meaningful step down in ridge and eaves, the side-facing dormer and the awkward asymmetrical roof profile would result in a form of development that fails to preserve the balance of the existing pair and does not respond appropriately to the established rhythm and character of Fryern Close. The proposal therefore conflicts with policy DM1 of the EBLP and the guidance in the Quality Places SPD.

Residential Amenity

Policy DM1 of the EBLP requires development to avoid unacceptable impacts on the residential amenities of existing and future occupiers. The Quality Places SPD advises that extensions should be designed so as not to harm neighbours' outlook, daylight or privacy, and that side windows and dormers require careful consideration so that they do not adversely affect neighbouring amenity.

The previous refusal under F/25/99379 found that upper floor windows facing towards the rear elevation and garden of 4 Fryern Close would result in a greater degree of overlooking and a harmful loss of privacy. That issue is a material consideration, but the current proposal falls to be assessed on its revised form.

On the basis of the amended proposal, the earlier overlooking concern has been addressed. The previous scheme's additional habitable room directly overlooking the neighbour has been removed, and the only additional opening now proposed in the rear elevation is a bathroom window to be obscure glazed. The side facing dormer would not

directly face the neighbouring property. In those circumstances, the proposal would not now give rise to the unacceptable overlooking identified in the earlier refusal.

The single storey rear extension could be partly erected under permitted development, and by virtue of this fall back position, the single storey height, boundary treatment (and the possibility to condition further treatment if necessary) and the separation distance, would not result in an unacceptable loss of light, outlook or overbearing impact to neighbouring occupiers.

In summary, the proposal is acceptable in residential amenity terms and does not conflict with policy DM1 of the EBLP.

Parking

Policy DM14 of the EBLP requires new residential development to provide off-street parking adequate in terms of highway safety and traffic management, having regard to the adopted Residential Parking Standards SPD. The Quality Places SPD also advises that, ideally, small-scale new development should not result in additional on-street parking and that in-curtilage parking will normally be required for existing development. It further emphasises that parking should not visually dominate the public realm.

As the current proposal is a householder extension and does not create an additional dwelling, its parking implications are materially different from those arising from the refused scheme under F/25/99379. Space is shown for parking for four vehicles to the front of the site. This exceeds the number of spaces required. The proposal is, therefore, in accordance with policy DM14 of the EBLP and the Residential Parking Standards SPD.

Ecology

Policy DM11 of the EBLP seeks to protect biodiversity interests and European sites. The supporting text to that policy explains that where protected species could be present, applicants will be required to undertake survey work, assessment and propose mitigation before proposals can be considered. The refusal of F/25/99379 is a material consideration, because that decision found the previous proposal unacceptable for failing to provide mitigation for effects on European protected sites and for failing to provide sufficient ecological information.

Those concerns do not carry through in the same way to the current proposal. The present application is an extension to an existing dwelling and does not create an additional residential unit. It would not increase overnight accommodation, and the recreational pressure and nutrient loading concerns that arose from the proposed new dwelling under F/25/99379 do not arise (as advised by Natural England).

An ecological assessment has now been submitted which identifies that no bats are present at the site. The previous concern regarding insufficient ecological information has, therefore, been addressed. There is no objection from the Council Ecologist.

As to biodiversity net gain, current government guidance states that householder applications are exempt from the mandatory biodiversity gain condition.

The application therefore complies with policy DM11 of the EBLP.

Climate Change

In July 2019, the Council declared a Climate Change and Environmental Emergency. In doing so it agreed, among other things, to: (a) put in place measures to ensure the Council's own operations and functions achieve carbon neutrality; (b) work with partners to aim for all projects and services delivered in the Borough to achieve carbon neutrality (c) ensure that the Council's procurement policy recognises carbon neutrality as one of its primary considerations; and (d) recognise the urgency of action to mitigate and adapt to climate change in every decision taken by the Council. This is underpinned by the Climate

and Environment Emergency Strategy 2020–2030 and the supporting Climate and Environmental Emergency Action Plan – Update June 2020.

The declaration of the Climate Change and Environmental Emergency demonstrates a strong commitment from the Council to achieve net zero. The NPPF, development plan and adopted local plan policy do not set this as a specific target, but it is a material consideration to be considered alongside all other material considerations. In any case addressing climate change is a core part of the NPPF and local plan policy. The need to support the economy is part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment for the adopted local plan, as is an assessment of climate impacts.

Equalities Implications

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty. Section 149 states:

- A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
 - a. eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - b. advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - c. foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

When making policy decisions, the Council must take account of the equality duty and in particular any potential impact on protected groups. It is considered that this application does not raise any equality implications

Conclusion

The proposal is acceptable in principle as an extension to an existing dwelling within the urban edge. The previous refusal under F/25/99379 is a material consideration and, following amendment of the scheme, the earlier concerns relating to overlooking, European site mitigation, ecological information and biodiversity net gain have either been addressed or no longer apply in the context of a householder extension. However, the principal design concern identified in that refusal remains. The proposed two-storey side extension would, by reason of its overall form, scale, massing and roof design, fail to appear as a subservient addition to the host semi-detached dwelling. The elongated roof form, lack of sufficient step down in ridge and eaves, incongruous side-facing dormer and awkward asymmetrical side profile would result in a visually dominant and poorly resolved addition that would fail to preserve the balance of the existing pair and would harm the character and appearance of Fryern Close. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy DM1 of the EBLP and the guidance in the Quality Places SPD.

Conclusion:

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☐

REFUSE ☒

Comments ...